UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,190	05/15/2006	Dominique Deslangle	6003.1071	7102

23280 7590 09/18/2008

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 7th Avenue
14th Floor
New York, NY 10018

EXAMINER
HINZE, LEO T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2854	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/579,190	DESLANGLE, DOMINIQUE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LEO T. HINZE	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 May 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *11-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *11-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 May 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *20060515*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 11, 12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andreasson, US 5,485,386 A (hereinafter Andreasson).

a. Regarding claim 11, Andreasson teaches a method for controlling the feeding of a web substrate into a printing press comprising the steps of: feeding the web substrate with a web tension into the printing press (16, Fig. 1); specifying a printing length to be achieved ("the print on forms obtains a predetermined length," col. 1, ll. 29-30); determining a current printing length of the printing press ("length of change of the web is measured," col. 1, ll. 53-54); and varying the web tension ("changing the web tension," col. 1, l. 62) by varying a length of the web substrate fed during one time interval as a function of a deviation of a current printing length from the printing length to be achieved ("due to the reduced stretching, the length of the web material decreases," col. 3, ll. 36-60).

b. Regarding claim 12, Andreasson teaches the method as recited in claim 11 as discussed in the rejection of claim 11 above. Andreasson also teaches wherein determining the current printing length includes calculating the current printing length based on at least one measurement of an angular velocity of a blanket cylinder and of the length of the web substrate fed during one time interval ("the length change of the web is measured in connection with at least an increase or decrease in the web tension, in that the web tension is measured either before or after the changing of the web tension or after each one of the changing of the web tension and in that the elongation is determined and if it is required corrected through an increase or a decrease in the web tension depending on said length change and web tension measurements," col. 1, l. 66 – col. 2, l. 7).

c. Regarding claim 14, Andreasson teaches the method as recited in claim 12 as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Andreasson also teaches calculating the length of the web substrate fed during one time interval based on a measurement of an angular velocity of a feed roller ("the web speed can be measured by counting pulses generated by a roll in contact with that part of the web," col. 2, ll. 3-7; "thus, a measure of the web travel length is obtained," col. 3, ll. 22-23).

d. Regarding claim 15, Andreasson teaches the method as recited in claim 11 as discussed in the rejection of claim 11 above. Andreasson also teaches wherein varying the length of the web substrate fed during one time interval includes varying the angular velocity of a feed roller ("in this way the peripherical speed of roll 7 is increased and simultaneously the web tension increases," col. 3, ll. 28-29; "there is a linear correlation

between the tension and the elongation of the web material," col. 3, ll. 45-46; thus, changing the tension by changing the roll speed changes the lengths of the web).

e. Regarding claim 16, Andreasson teaches the method as recited in claim 11 as discussed in the rejection of claim 11 above. Andreasson also teaches a relationship between the web tension and the current printing length is a linear relationship ("there is a linear correlation between the tension and the elongation of the web material," col. 3, ll. 45-46).

f. Regarding claim 17, Andreasson teaches the method as recited in claim 16 as discussed in the rejection of claim 16 above. Andreasson also teaches parameterizing the linear relationship as a function of a type of printing substrate or a type of rubber blanket used ("there is a linear correlation between the tension and the elongation of the web material," col. 3, ll. 45-46; the "parameters" of the relationship include the type of web material, as each web material has a different linear correlation).

g. Regarding claim 18, Andreasson teaches the method as recited in claim 11 as discussed in the rejection of claim 11 above. Andreasson also teaches a device for controlling the feeding of a web substrate into a printing press (Fig. 1) comprising: an actuator for adjusting the length of web substrate to be fed during one time interval (5, 17, Fig. 1); a computer for calculating a driving of the actuator; a memory unit of the computer (17, Fig. 1); and a program stored in the memory unit (unlabeled memory unit in 17 "stored in a memory," col. 3, ll. 15-16); the program having at least one part executing a control of the device in accordance with the method as recited in claim 11 (see rejection of claim 11 above).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreasson.

Andreasson teaches the method as recited in claim 11 as discussed in the rejection of claim 11 above. Andreasson also teaches

Andreasson does not teach wherein calculating the current printing length includes taking a plurality of measurements and averaging a plurality of results.

One having ordinary skill in the art is likely to have a certain level of mathematics and statistics knowledge, including the ability to calculate an average value given several different values.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Andreasson to take a plurality of measurements and then calculate an average of the plurality of measurements, because one having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that using an average value may prevent making adjustments based on a single aberrant value that may be much greater or less than an average value.

6. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreasson in view of Dufour, US 6,186,064 B1 (hereinafter Dufour).

a. Regarding claims 19 and 20:

Andreasson teaches the rotary press as recited in claim 18 as discussed in the rejection of claim 18 above.

Andreasson does not teach a plurality of web substrates comprising: a plurality of unwind units; and printing towers having a plurality of print units.

Dufour teaches a plurality of web substrates (4a, 4b, and 4c, Fig. 1) comprising: a plurality of unwind units (see unlabeled unwind units, Fig. 1); printing towers having a plurality of print units (towers 2a-2d, Fig. 1.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Andreasson to include a plurality of web substrates comprising a plurality of unwind units and printing towers having a plurality of print units as taught by Dufour, because the addition of the plurality of webs and printing units would predictably expand the capabilities of Andreasson to allow greater printing output.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leo T. Hinze whose telephone number is 571.272.2864. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on 571.272.2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Anthony H Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2854

Leo T. Hinze
Patent Examiner
AU 2854
12 September 2008